## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA CHARLESTON DIVISION

Keith Wellin, individually and as Trustee of the Keith S. Wellin Florida Revocable Living Trust u/a/d December 11, 2001,	) C/A No. 2:13-cv-1831 DCN )
Plaintiff,	ORDER
-VS-	)
Peter J. Wellin, Cynthia W. Plum, and Marjorie W. King, individually and as Co-Trustees and Beneficiaries of the Wellin Family 2009 Irrevocable Trust u/a/d November 2, 2009, and Friendship Management, LLC,	) ) ) ) ) )
Defendants.	)
Lester S. Schwartz, as Trust Protector of the Wellin Family 2009 Irrevocable Trust,	) C/A No. 2:13-cv-3595 DCN
Plaintiff,	)
-VS-	)
Peter J. Wellin, Cynthia W. Plum and Marjorie W. King, individually and as Co-Trustees and Beneficiaries of the Wellin Family 2009 Irrevocable Trust, Friendship Management, LLC, and Cynthia W. Plum as Manager of Friendship Management, LLC,	) ) ) ) ) )
Defendants.	)
Peter J. Wellin, Cynthia W. Plum and Marjorie W. King, as Co-Trustees of the Wellin Family 2009 Irrevocable Trust,	) ) ) )
Counterclaim Plaintiffs,	)
-VS-	)
Lester S. Schwartz, Esq., as Trust Protector of the Wellin Family 2009 Irrevocable Trust u/a/d November 2, 2009, and Keith Wellin, as Grantor of the Wellin Family 2009 Irrevocable Trust u/a/d November 2, 2009,	) ) ) ) ) )
Counterclaim Defendants.	)

Peter J. Wellin, Cynthia Wellin Plum, and	)	C/A No. 2:14-cv-4067 DCN
Majorie Wellin King, Individually and as	)	
Co-Trustees and Beneficiaries of the Wellin	)	
Family 2009 Irrevocable Trust u/a/d	)	
November 2, 2009,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
-VS-	)	
	)	
Wendy Wellin, Individually and as Trustee of	)	
the Keith S. Wellin Florida Revocable Living	)	
Trust u/a/d December 11, 2001,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

The above referenced cases are before this court upon the Special Master's recommendation that the Wellin Children's motion to compel (ECF No. 718 in C/A No. 2:13cv1831, ECF No. 750 in C/A No. 2:13cv3595, and ECF No. 496 in 2:14cv4067) be granted, and Wendy Wellin be required to produce Exhibits 28 and 31 in their entirety.

This court is charged with conducting a <u>de novo</u> review of any portion of the Special Master's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, absent prompt objection by a dissatisfied party, it appears that Congress did not intend for the district court to review the factual and legal conclusions of the Special Master. <u>Thomas v Arn</u>, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Additionally, any party who fails to file timely, written objections to the Special Master's report pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) waives the right to raise those objections at the appellate court level. <u>United States v. Schronce</u>, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984), <u>cert. denied</u>, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984). No objections have been filed to the Special Master's report and recommenda-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>In Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985), the court held "that a <u>pro se</u> litigant must receive fair notification of the <u>consequences</u> of failure to object to a magistrate judge's report before such a procedural default will result in waiver of the right to appeal. The notice must be 'sufficiently understandable to one in appellant's circumstances fairly to appraise him of what is required." <u>Id.</u> at 846. Plaintiff was advised in a clear manner that his objections had to be filed within ten (10) days, and he received

tion.

A <u>de novo</u> review of the record indicates that the Special Master's report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. Accordingly, the Special Master's report and recommendation is **AFFIRMED**, and the Wellin Children's motion to compel the production of Exhibits 28 and 31 in their entirety is **GRANTED**.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

David C. Norton

United States District Judge

November 14, 2018 Charleston, South Carolina

## NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

notice of the <u>consequences</u> at the appellate level of his failure to object to the magistrate judge's report.